

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 - 34 remain in the application. Claims 1, 8, 23, 26, 28, 29, and 31 - 34 have been amended.

In the Office action the Examiner objected to claims 8 and 34 as they depend from themselves. These claims have been amended to depend from claims 7 and 33, respectively.

Claims 1 - 28 were rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner indicated uncertainty in the meaning of the limitation, "the apertures have dimensions that are no larger than the greater of 1/10 of the wavelength or 200 microns. Claims 1 and 28 (which contain the limitation in question) have been amended to more clearly set forth the invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the component "guides or controls a desired radiation" and to indicate that "the apertures have cross-sectional dimensions that are no larger than the greater of 1/10 of the a wavelength of the desired radiation or 200 microns and which wherein the apertures are not intended to pass a significant amount of the desired RF-radiation". Claim 28 has been amended in an analogous manner. It is believed that the claims now indicate that the 1/10 of the wavelength pertains to a wavelength of radiation that is to be handled by the component (i.e. desired radiation). The claim also indicates that it is the cross-sectional dimensions of the aperture(s) that are not larger than the greater of 1/10 of the wavelength or 200 microns (i.e. 200 micrometers). It is believed that these amendments provide appropriate clarity and as such withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1, 10 - 12, 16, and 26 were rejected under 35 USC 102b as being anticipated by Nakahara (USP 3,729,740). This rejection is traversed. The apertures disclosed by Nakahara are intended to pass significant amounts of his desired radiation (that is what they are made for) whereas in amended claims 1 and 28 it is clear that the apertures are not intended to pass the desired radiation. In some embodiments, the apertures are intended to provide openings for releasing a sacrificial material from between the central conductor and the conductive structure (see, for example claim 2). It is not desirable nor intended that these apertures pass significant amounts of the

desired radiation. In view of the claim amendments and the comments above, it is believed to be clear that the claims as presented do not read on the teachings of Nakahara and thus withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 102b is earnestly solicited.

In view of the amendments and remarks, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and passage to allowance is earnestly solicited. If any questions should arise concerning this application (or if it would otherwise be useful to discuss this application) please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned by phone so as to expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Microfabrica Inc.
1103 W. Isabel St.
Burbank, CA 91506
Ph: (818) 295-3996, ext. 105
Fx: (818) 848-2744

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dennis R. Smalley", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Dennis R. Smalley
Reg. No. 35,364